DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 805 SP 008 707

TITLE	The 1974 Annual Report of the New England Program in Teacher Education (Inc.).
INSTITUTION	New England Program in Teacher Education, Durham, N.H.
PUB DATE	Sep 74
NOTE	55p.
AVAILABLE FROM	NEPTE Pettee Brook Offices, P.O. Box 550, Durham, New Hampshire 03824 (No price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Annual Reports; *Change Agents; Consultants; Educational Improvement; *Interstate Programs; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	NEPTE; New England; *New England Program in Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This report of the activities of the New England Program in Teacher Education (NEPTE) during the period of July 1973 through June 1974 is divided into 10 sections. The introduction briefly describes NEPTE's purpose and history. The second section communicates the general thrust of the year's activity toward finding sources of funding other than the New England Regional Commission, its original source. Staff changes are noted in the third section. The fourth section briefly describes nine NEPTE proposals that were funded and two that were not. The fifth section discusses the impact of defunding by the New England Regional Commission. Twenty-two developmental projects funded by NEPTE are described in section 6. The following section describes a survey of NEPTE project directors conducted to identify key factors of successful projects, which were defined as those that enabled projects to obtain funding from non-NEPTE sources. The eighth section is a report of the activities of NEPTE field agents. The ninth section discusses activities in which the school and community shared in significant decisions regarding the educational program. The last section reports the status of "The Common," the newspaper of the New England Program in Teacher Education. (HMD)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Transitional Year	1
Staff	2
New Approaches	3
Final Phasing Out	6
List of Developmental Projects	6
Survey of NEPTE Projects	18
Field Agent Report	31
Partnership Schools	45
Common	46

INTRODUCTION

The following remarks constitute the annual report of the fourth year of the New England Program in Teacher Education, Inc. (NEPTE). Originally funded as a project of the New England Regional Commission, NEPTE is a non-profit organization with the task of improving the quality of teacher education in the six New England states. NEPTE is governed by a 24 member board of directors, two community members and two professional educators from each of the six New England states. The period covered in this report is July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974.

TRANSITIONAL YEAR

As the title of this section suggests, FY 74 has been a transitional year for NEPTE. Reduced levels of education funds have caused considerable retrenchment in most federally funded projects, especially those projects with a strong research and development thrust. Funds available to NEPTE from the New England Regional Commission were also limited and ended with FY 74. Consequently, NEPTE had (1) to look for ways to economize in its FY 74 activities, and (2) to develop strategies that would enable NEPTE to survive without support from the New England Regional Commission.

In order to economize in the FY 74 operations, NEPTE took the following courses of action: (1) drastically reduced both its central staff from six to two persons and central support of the six field agents; (2) reduced the number of new (FY 74) proposals funded; (3) carefully negotiated the final amounts of FY 74 proposals selected (12 in all) to insure that all possible budget reductions were realized; (4) utilized the six field agents wherever possible to take some of the work load of the reduced central staff; and (5) increasingly utilized the ideas and direct support of a highly competent and active Board of Directors.

As a result of the foregoing economy measures, the two persons on the central staff were able to devote a large portion of time to exploring possible funding sources and developing proposals in areas where NEPTE's experience, particularly the field agent model, could be effectively employed. The result of the transitional year efforts is that NEPTE will survive. Rather than serving primarily as a funding agency for proposals from institutions, agencies and individuals according to NEPTE-developed guidelines, NEPTE develops its own proposals for funding and enters into contracts for specific services with institutions and agencies. An obvious implication for NEPTE operation is an increased emphasis on training and product development.

STAFF

The NEPTE Central Staff (August 1973) consisted of a director, an executive assistant and four central office personnel. In addition, the six field agents served were assigned in the states of the region. By September 1, Central Staff consisted of two persons, a director and a special projects officer. The field agents in Maine and Rhode Island continued

without change; the other four field agents resigned for various reasons and were replaced. It should be noted here that the NEPTE staff itself constituted an innovation designed to respond to particular needs for programs rather than to institutional needs directed at organizational structures or control procedures. In effect, the Central Staff was an invention designed to influence regional institutions, and the field agents were an invention designed to influence state institutions.

NEW APPROACHES

As noted in the previous section, the two NEPTE Central Staff persons devoted a large portion of time to developing proposals and contracts for special services. The proposals and contracts developed and/or under negotiation can be grouped according to the following primary functions: (1) training; (2) development; (3) research; and (4) documentation. Some proposal and contract functions cut across the four categories. Further, the 11 proposals and contracts are divided into (1) funded projects, and (2) non-funded projects. The following proposals and contracts were developed and funded:

1. New England Interstate 505 - This project serves the Commissioners of Education of five New England states. It provides training on management by objectives (MBO) to designate state department of education personnel in the five states.
2. New England Field Agent Grant - This grant represents the continuation of the FY 73 Field Agent Grant. Funds obtained support the activities of the six field agents in the New England region for FY 74.

3. Principals Performance Certification 505 - The primary objective of this project is the development of a regional model for the certification of principals based on role-related performance standards drawn from research, case studies, and experience which are found operable and acceptable by a representative interstate advisory council, by in-state advisory councils, and by responsible state education staff persons. The standards are to be developed for urban, suburban, rural and regional school settings.
4. Rockingham Special Education - The purpose of this project is to assess the needs of handicapped children. This will be accomplished through an assessment of the community to determine the opportunities for handicapped children, and through an assessment of the school to determine the potential of the school to meet identified needs. A secondary purpose of the study will be to document carefully the procedures utilized so that they may be organized into some type of manual that may be used in other communities.
5. Massachusetts Special Education Evaluation Criteria Study - The purpose of this study is the development of guidelines for the evaluation of private schools for the handicapped.
6. Project Five-Early Childhood - The purpose of this project is the establishment of a model that will link school programs with parents and health and social service agency personnel in the Exeter, N.H. area.

7. New Hampshire Vocational-Technical Teacher Training - The purpose of this project is the development of a training program that will facilitate inservice staff development of vocational personnel on the secondary level in New Hampshire.
8. New England Teacher Corps Network - In this project, NEPTE will act as a facilitator for the development and operation of a Teacher Corps Center which is tied to the National Teacher Corps network. As part of the National Teacher Corps network, NEPTE will be responsible for monitoring and assisting regional Teacher Corps projects.
9. Open Education Seminar for the University of New Hampshire School of Continuing Studies - The purpose of this activity was the development and pilot testing of a course for teachers in open education. The pilot test phase of this project is now completed. The project staff are currently revising the course and will field test the course this year (FY 75). The unique feature of this project is that the course was cooperatively planned with teachers and students to allow for personalization of instruction.

The following proposals were developed and <u>did not receive funding</u>:

1. Bureau of Educational Handicapped-Area Learning Resource Center - In this project NEPTE would have developed a seven state cooperative area learning resource center (ALRC). The ALRC would have provided a system for delivering services to handicapped children, parents, and educational personnel in the areas of material, media, and technical assistance.

2. Bureau of Educational Handicapped-Regional Resource Center - This project would have been similar to number two (2) above. The different areas of service would have centered on assessment and development of educational prescriptions for the handicapped.

FINAL PHASING OUT OF NERCOM FUNDED DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 1974 marked the final year of NERCOM funding for developmental activities. A total of 12 projects received funds. The six previously funded staff development cooperatives were allowed to carry over unexpended FY 73 funds, as was the Penquiscock Project. Other projects such as ANISA, Project ERR and the Gresham Chair (Robert Gillette) continued without additional funding. All project directors were informed of the necessity to develop linkages with local funding sources or funding sources other than NEPTE if they were to survive beyond FY 74.

LISTING OF DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

A total of twenty-two (22) projects were either funded or continued to maintain activities with NEPTE. These fell into the following four categories: (1) Projects receiving FY 74 funds--some of these projects had received prior NEPTE support, but FY 74 funds were awarded on the basis of separate proposals building on earlier funded activities or adding new activities; (2) Projects operating on FY 73 carry-over funds--all of these projects were Staff Development Cooperatives. No new proposal was submitted and each cooperative was allowed to use carry-over funds to complete FY 73 project activities; (3) Continuation Projects--there are three projects in this category and each continued on a different funding basis. One of the

three projects operated on carry-over FY 73 funds. One received NEPTE funds that had been previously (FY 73) allocated. One received no additional NEPTE funds. Perhaps, the common element which sets these three projects apart from projects in category two was that in each case NEPTE involvement was greater (either technical support or assistance in gaining non-NEPTE funding); and (4) Projects no longer directly associated with NEPTE, but maintaining liaison.

Projects Funded with FY 74 Funds

1.	Barbour School Community Partnership Hartford, CT	Open Partnership Project	Freddie Morris (203) 552-0166

Continuation of Community School Partnerships. Focused on: (1) leadership training, (2) humanistic education, and (3) developing community resources. Emphasis for FY 74 action: definition and/or refinement of procedures developed to implement the three project areas. Also documentation of the project philosophy.

2.	Westminster West Schools Putney, VT	Open Partnership Project	Clair Oglesby (802) 387-5767

The development of a School and Community Learning Center as a major part of the School and Community Partnership which had been designed and became highly successful through prior NEPTE-supported efforts. The project also extended several individualized-instruction, open-classroom techniques appropriate to a rural setting that had proven successful (FY 73 NEPTE supported activities).

3. Colebrook Consolidated School — Open Partnership Project — Evelyn Burnham (203) 379-2179
Colebrook, CT

Continuation and further development of a Horizons Unlimited Program developed the previous year. Program designed to cut across grade lines and into the community (use community resources--people) to the end of raising the low motivations and limited aspirations of children isolated (largely geographic isolation) from economic and cultural advantages.

4. Highland Park Free School — Open Partnership Project — James Brown (207) 636-1751
Roxbury, MA

Continuation of a program for teacher and school development in school and community partnership. Particular emphasis (FY 74) given to staff development and community involvement. Attempt to strengthen and formalize many of the training procedures used the previous year. Attempt to formalize or at least regularize partnership governance practices.

5. Little Harbor School — Open Partnership Project — Charlotte Fardelmann (603) 436-7652 Home 436-1708 School
Portsmouth, NH

To train and utilize paraprofessionals as counselors in the elementary school classroom. Mothers and grandmothers serve as counselors in grades 2-4 with a ratio of 60:1. Long-range goal is reinforcement of the disruptive child, at the same time easing the tension in a classroom environment resulting from the activity of the acting-out child. Unique feature--immediacy of response to student actions.

6. Connecticut Staff Development Cooperative — Robert Avery (203) 281-3343
Hamden, CT

Three proposals were submitted listing this Staff Development Cooperative training and support agency. All were related to various aspects of bilingual/bicultural teacher training.

a) A Pairing Model for Bilingual/ Bicultural Education — George Barbarito, New Haven, CT

Experimental pilot program in which two teachers, one with Spanish as the native language and one with English as the native language, are responsible for the education of a group of 50 first and second grade native Spanish-speaking children.

b) Staffing and Training Proposal in Bilingual Education — Michael Lynch, New Britain, CT, (203) 224-9121

Proposal to recruit new Spanish-speaking teachers (often from outside the U.S.), orient these teachers, and then provide them with follow-up inservice training and/or other support (Connecticut SDC does recruitment and training).

c) Development and Demonstration of an Effective Educational Model for Spanish-Dominant Children — Vincent Cibbarelli, (203) 847-0481, Norwalk, CT

Attempt to "mainstream" Spanish-speaking children with learning disabilities. Separation of Spanish-speaking children with learning disabilities constitutes a "double handicap", thus the need to get them into regular classrooms for as much of their education as is possible. Activities: inservice training in special education to bilingual teachers, establishment of a Learning Disabilities Center, development of more effective procedures for diagnosing learning disabilities of Spanish-speaking children.

7. Upper Valley NEPTE, Lebanon, NH — Mary Rutherford, (603) 643-5533

Project to train advisors who can then provide close personal and professional support to beginning teachers. Focus on principals. Assumption: principals don't know how to help teachers--principal must learn how to be an instructional leader. Each advisor works with principals so that they can better work with their teachers. Major Activity: Seminar on Evaluation for Principals:

needs-assessment procedures, goal-setting techniques, problems identification, systems approaches to planning and budgeting, future forecasting, and other concerns.

8. University of Maine, Farmington
Farmington, ME

Ross Fearon
(207) 778-3501

A project designed to develop and test in school settings early field experiences for sophomore and junior teacher-education students. Unique feature: teachers in Mt. Blue School designed the various combinations of experiences and determined the appropriateness of the activities as to level and whether they should be included in the University of Maine, Farmington, regular teacher education program.

9. McLean Hospital
Belmont, MA

Maurice Vanderpol
(617) 855-2000

A training program designed to improve the performance of public school teachers by allying them with a staff of trainers whose expertise is in areas of psychiatry and psychology. Training of teachers focused on combating biases that teachers develop because of a child's deficient cognitive performance or his acting out behavior. Involved cooperative efforts of schools in the Boston area (community personnel, teachers, school administrators and parents).

10. Women's Training and Resources Corporation
Portland, ME

Ko Kimmel
(207) 772-5484

A training project for guidance counselors in the Northern New England secondary schools designed to reduce the effects of sexism on career motivation of secondary school female students. Basic Premise: counselors unable to deal effectively with broadening career opportunity for women; hence, counselors need inservice training.

11. Shapleigh Memorial School
Shapleigh, ME

James Brown
(207) 324-2051

A training program (two week institute) for teachers and community on Humanistic Education in the Learning Process. Assumption: that a range on interpersonal skills can be accepted, internalized, and implemented. Expected Outcomes: that teachers would exhibit affective development, and that community people would exhibit greater interest and involvement in the schools.

12. Southern New Hampshire Staff Development Cooperative
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

Michael Andrew
(603) 862-2310

The Southern New Hampshire Educational Staff Development Cooperative includes four local school districts, the State Department of Education, the New Hampshire Education Association, the University of New Hampshire, and New England College. The project staff implemented an integrated preservice-inservice program for educational staff development. The program complements the new State Certification Requirements for local responsibility for in-service education. Matching funds from local districts are provided for inservice programs. Major activities: helping local school districts design inservice training programs, publishing developments in a Master Plan Newsletter and sharing local expertise through listings.

Projects Operating on FY 73 Carry-over Funds

13. North County Network
C-Force Action Center
Lyndonville, VT

June Elliot
(802) 626-3355

Continuation of an FY 73 project which served nine supervisory unions in the North East Kingdom of Vermont and seven northern supervisory unions in New Hampshire. The goal was to select and coordinate educational projects in New Hampshire and Vermont which would test interstate cooperation. Model projects were selected in the areas of career education, open education, environmental education and staff development. FY 74 Activities: unexpended funds were re-allocated to the Caldonia North School District for the final phase of the project, which was the development and publication of a directory of outstanding educational resource people in the North Country and North East Kingdom with skills (primarily through not exclusively) in career education, open education, environmental education.

14. Vermont Staff Development Cooperative
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT

Bud Meyers
(802) 656-3356
Ext. 4161

Continuation of a project focused on the development of a comprehensive arrangement of schools, colleges and the State Department of Education to develop locally originated teacher pre-service and in-service training and teacher certification programs. This year's activities were primarily centered on the generation of staff development positions in the local school districts which were tied to the Vermont local school district option for teacher certification.

15. Southeastern New England Staff Development Cooperative
Rhode Island College
Providence, RI

Mary Lou O'Connor
(617) 872-3501
Ext. 381

Continuation of a project (R.I. SDC) focusing on the identification and implementation of new relations between school, community and college in teacher education programs through the simultaneous individualization of instruction at college and school levels. The major acitivity was the development of learning activity packages (modules) for performance based teacher training and for children. Three workshops were held to disseminate programs earlier developed to other interested educators in R.I. and Massachusetts.

16. Interstate Staff Development Cooperative
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA

Masha Rudman
(413) 545-1588

Continuation of a project focusing on planning for and implementing an Integrated Day open classroom in participating school districts. State departments of education and school districts in Maine, Massachusetts and Vermont together with the Universities of Massachusetts and New Hampshire are collaborating in this interstate SDC. Major features: Newsletter, In Touch with provides a general communications link and resource people in each school district.

17. Connecticut Staff Development Cooperative
Hamden-New Haven Cooperative Center
Hamden, CT

Robert Avery
(203) 281-3343

Continuation of program efforts in Connecticut cities focusing on developing educational staff through the cooperative efforts of university faculties, their student teachers and experienced teachers of various urban school systems. Special emphasis on bilingual/bicultural programs, special education--learning disabilities settings for non-native English speaking children,

and community relations training. Focus this year is on development of specific bilingual/bicultural training processes and products (see #6 for examples where SDC is the project training agency).

18. Maine Staff Development Cooperative
Farwell School
Lewiston, ME

Henry Hall
(207) 782-9551

Continuation and completion of a project focusing on the ways in which organizational structure changes when policy and decision making for training are teacher controlled. The project sought to shift control from administrators to classroom teachers in local school systems. Persons involved included professional and para-professional staff from two school districts, the community, and the state university system.

Continuation Project

19. Center for the Study of Human Potential
(ANISA)
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA

Daniel Jordan
(413) 545-0873

A comprehensive research and pilot testing program to determine the teacher education program by which teachers will be trained to manage learning and the development of children in ways in which research indicates the child's learning potential is released. Three sites, Kansas City, Suffield, CT, and Hamden, ME implemented the ANISA design. Initial efforts focus on primary grades with higher grades added in successive years, i.e., first year pilot in first grade then expand to second grade the next year, and so on until all grade level personnel are trained to operate the ANISA Model.

20. Gresham Chair
Andrew Warde High School
Fairfield, CT

Robert Gillette
(203) 255-0421

An award to an excellent classroom teacher who created a real world-oriented program for disenchanted high school students with extensive outdoor activities emphasizing physical involvement and group development. The program combines English, Social Studies, Science and Physical Education curriculum. It involves parents, other teachers, and persons from the broader community. Gresham Chair funds were sub-granted to other projects. Basic guidelines for Gresham sub-grants were: (1) opportunity for Human Resource Development; (2) investment for matching and outreach; (3) investment for a multiplier effect; (4) investment for seeding; and (5) investment through turnkey experts. Persons or groups receiving funds were expected to give back their experience and growth to others.

21. Penquiscock Superintendents' Association
Bangor, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Hancock Counties
Bangor, ME

Fran Fuller
(207) 942-2261

Continuation of a regional, community-based, teacher education resource network in Bangor City, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Hancock counties. Basic goal: to test a Maine Model for group decision-making on inservice education with input from all critical institutions, professions, and client groups with the exception of the student. Nine member Governance Board--three community members, two teachers, one school principal, one school superintendent, one professor of education, one teacher certification officer (State Department of Education).

Projects Maintaining a Liaison with NEPTE

22. Southeast Massachusetts Regional Office (Project ERR)
Department of Education
Buzzards Bay, MA

John Flynn
(401) 295-4191

Project ERR (Educational Redirection and Recycling) formerly supported by NEPTE. The project staff were able to prove their model to the point where the project is now supported by membership assessments currently provided by: (1) 20 school districts in Southeastern Massachusetts; (2) two area colleges, Bridgewater State and Southeastern Massachusetts University; and (3) the Department of Education (Southeast Regional Center). ERR is a service program for teachers and administrators in transitional situations: (1) new teachers in the classroom; (2) experienced teachers and administrators involved in a new setting, i.e. traditional to open-school setting; and (3) personnel setting up new middle schools or kindergartens. Activities: (1) workshops; (2) discussion series; and (3) laboratories resulting from local district needs assessments.

Summary - Funded Projects

As the preceding section, indicates only 12 projects received FY 74 funds and one, the Gresham Chair, received previously allocated funds. All other projects operated on a limited basis by using carry-over funds or funds from sources other than NEPTE. Some projects had made progress in developing funding sources during FY 73. All project directors realized that this was the pivotal year, i.e. they must either disband or be supported by non-NEPTE funds. The projects were encouraged to develop ways of institutionalizing or relating themselves in some way or another to local groups that they had been working with during their preceding year, or,

in the case of the 12 FY 74 projects, during the current year. To a significant degree, these efforts were successful.

Implicit in NEPTE's selection of projects was a commitment to engage in dialogue about education and to cause other educators and interested community people to begin and extend such a dialogue. NEPTE stressed in its request for proposals the need for collaborative efforts, the development of interdependent relationships, and the like. Most of the NEPTE projects brought together people who had not worked together previously in any complex or significant way. In some towns and areas they brought people together that had never seen one another before. Many of the areas and communities served by NEPTE projects have voted to continue the existence of parts of the NEPTE project, e.g. the project steering committee or the advisory board.

The degree of NEPTE project visibility in terms of educational change, staff and community growth, and more supportive attitudes toward and involvement in education by parents and community people varies greatly. In a project such as ERR the impact (visibility) of the project is obvious; one need only count workshops, observe training, etc. In other projects such as the North County Network and the Maine SDC the changes are less quantifiable and often subtle. Yet, if one were to poke around a bit, it would become clear that attitudes of some teachers, building and central office administrators, teacher educators, and parents have changed. People are talking to one another who previously had not. People are trying to reduce adversary relationships and build cooperative relationships. These changes are subtle since the projects failed to institutionalize a model or process. Yet, changes have occurred and may, over time, benefit from a multiplier effect.

NEPTE staff have been particularly concerned with: (1) the degree to which the educational dialogue and adaptation of educational innovation (made possible by New England Regional Commission funds) has expanded within the New England region as a result of project activities as well as other NEPTE activities such as the Field Agents and The Common newspaper; and (2) the effect(s) of modifying NEPTE projects that they might be acceptable to other clients (funding sources). A survey of the 22 NPETE projects gave some answers.

SURVEY OF NEPTE PROJECTS

NEPTE staff asked six questions of the NEPTE Project Directors. The questions were designed to obtain information on: (1) project goals and objectives; (2) means or mechanisms that enabled project personnel to connect available resources with present or potential client groups (users); (3) project decision-making procedures in terms of how the project was governed and how parity of representation was defined; (4) type of communications employed; and (5) the perceived impact of the project in terms of a particular product or process, or model.

A total of 15 project directors responded to the interview survey. The other seven projects either had not operated long enough to be able to answer the questions or the project directors were not available for comments. The following tables present a summary of the information received in the phone interviews with project directors. Table A shows summary information for the six questions asked of project directors. Table B shows examples of linkage mechanisms employed and products/processes developed by the respective projects.

Discussion of Survey Hypotheses

Goals and Objectives - The hypothesis of NEPTE staff was that in order to obtain continuation of funding from non-NEPTE sources the respective projects would have to move from relatively general goals and objectives to much more focused objectives which would relate to the specific needs of the group or groups served by the project. As can be seen from a review of Table A, column one, this hypothesis was supported. Some projects such as the project at the University of Maine in Farmington and the Interstate SDC began with specific objectives. Most projects started with general goals and objectives which were refined to meet the needs of user groups. Eleven projects in all said that they either had started with specific objectives which met the needs of user groups or had moved toward specific objectives. The four projects which did not have specific objectives all indicated that they had not been successful to date in securing non-NEPTE funds. Further, project directors in all four cases agreed that the lack of specific objectives designed to meet the needs of potential user groups and the inability to develop such objectives had been a major reason for their inability to secure continuation of support. Two other projects, ANISA and Colebrook School, indicated that they had general goals and that they set specific objectives designed to meet the needs of a particular school (ANISA) or a particular group of students (Colebrook School). In summary, all project directors agreed that clearly stated specific goals and objectives were a necessity for developing project support.

Sources for Continuation Funding - As can be seen from a review of Table A, column two, 10 of the 15 projects indicated that they had definite funds to continue in FY 75. Three other projects indicated that they would continue without funds and two projects did not know what would happen in

TABLE A

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO NEPTE SURVEY OF PROJECT DIRECTORS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Project	Developed Specific Goals and or Objectives	Source for Continuation of project	Developed a mechanism to link resources to users	Practiced Shared Decision Making	Developed Effective Communication	Type of Communication	Parity in Project Planning and Operation	Project Impact Define in terms of a product or process (model)
	Question Asked Project Directors							
Colebrook School	Y	LEA Budget	Y	N	Y	No information	Y	Y
University of Maine, Farmington	Y	LEA & College	Y	Y	Y	Task Forces	N	Y
Upper Valley NEPTE	Y	LEA Contract & College	Y	N	Y	F to I	N	Y
Little Harbor	Y	LEA & Fed.(HEW)	Y	N	Y	I	N	Y
Barbour School	N	?	N	Y	Y	F & I	Y	N
Connecticut SDC	Y	LEA & SEA Contract	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
N. County Network	Y	No funds but will carry on	Y	N	Y	F to I	Y	Y
SENESDC	N	No funds, use in-kind college & LEA	N	N	Y	F-general	N	N
Maine SDC	N	No funds COP or other	N	N	Y-Lewiston N-Auburn	I I	Y N	N

TABLE A (Continued)

Project	Developed Specific Goals and or Objectives	Source for Continuation of project	Developed a mechanism to link resources to users	Practiced Shared Decision Making	Developed Effective Communications	Type of Communication	Parity in Project Planning and Operation	Project Impact Define in terms of a product or process (model)
	Question Asked Project Directors							
Vermont SDC	Y	LEA-College Contract	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y
Interstate SDC	Y	College	Y	N	Y	F-In Touch I-resource people	Y	Y
Penquiscock	N	?	N	N	N	F	N	N
ANISA	Y	LEA Contracts & College	Y	Y	Y	F & I	Y	Y
Gresham Chair Project	Y	Variety LEA & self support	Y	N	Y	I	N	Y
Project ERR	Y	LEA Contract	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y

FY 75. Clearly, funds for projects came from two primary sources, local school district funds (LEA) and from college and university funds. Income cases such as Colebrook School and Project ERR, all funds came from local school district budgets or local school district contracts. Most projects such as the Vermont SDC, Upper Valley NEPTE and the University of Maine in Farmington were jointly funded by local school districts and one or more college or university. Generalizations here are difficult, but it does appear that NEPTE projects have been able to establish a dialogue between public school people and college and university personnel, frequently resulting in formal financial support of a given educational program or concept.

Development of Linkage Mechanisms - The hypothesis of NEPTE staff was that some type of mechanism would have to be developed to link NEPTE project resources with potential user groups if the project were to be continued without NEPTE funds. A review of Table A, column three, shows that 11 projects had developed a mechanism and four had not. All four projects which had not developed a mechanism were projects which failed to secure continuation funds. Also, all four projects which had not developed a linkage mechanism had either tried to do so unsuccessfully, such as Penquisock and the Maine SDC, or agreed that they should have developed the linkage mechanism, Barbour School and SENESDC. Apparently, the ability to develop successful linkage mechanisms is a key factor in project continuation.

Shared Decision Making - The hypothesis of NEPTE staff was that projects that were continued would evidence shared decision making in the planning and implementation of the respective projects. Shared decision making was defined as the cooperative action of two or more groups involved in or affected by a given project. The intent of NEPTE was that existing institutions such as the faculty in teacher education at a given college or

university would broaden membership on planning and governing committees to include other groups such as local school people, community representatives, and students.

The information received on this question does not support the foregoing NEPTE definition of shared decision making. Only six of the 15 project directors felt that the NEPTE definition of shared decision making had been followed. Various different educational groups tended to be dominant in the decision-making processes of a given project. One thing was clear: community representatives were typically not represented or fully represented on the general steering committees and operational committees of the respective projects. The most frequent comment of project directors was that the representation on project advisory committees or operating subcommittees should reflect those groups most directly involved with the project and/or the funding of the project.

It was also clear that NEPTE project staff had been successful in moving to a supportive rather than directive role in terms of project decision making. A variety of decision-making techniques were implemented: 1) Upper Valley NEPTE--utilized specific ad hoc groups for specific tasks; 2) University of Maine in Farmington--allowed control of their project to shift almost completely to local school district teachers; 3) Connecticut SDC--utilized a general advisory group. In the case of projects that were not continued, the following comments were received: 1) SENESDC--poor community involvement, college personnel predominant; 2) Maine SDC--unable to involve any groups other than local school district teachers; 3) Penquiscock--general steering committee utilized but not felt to be representative; 4) Barbour School--practiced shared decision making but found it hard to keep the initial group (PTA) from making all the decisions; 5) North County Network--professors of education predominated.

The guiding principle, as expressed by the project directors interviewed, was that decision making should realistically reflect those groups most directly affected by or responsible for project goals and objectives.

Development of Effective Communications - The hypothesis of NEPTE staff was that projects would develop effective two-way communication--project staff to users and users to project staff. An assumption was that communication would tend toward direct person-to-person exchanges rather than more general and formal means. A review of Table A, column five, shows that 12 of the project directors felt that effective communication had been established--including all projects that had been continued with non-NEPTE funds. The Maine SDC and SENESDC had established effective communications in a portion of their project. Penquiscock was unable to develop effective communications. The responses received show that effective communication is a primary requisite for project continuation.

Type of Communication Employed - Table A, column six lists types of communication employed in terms of formal (F) and informal (I). Formal communications includes such things as newsletters, form letters, general memos, TV or radio. Informal communications includes personal letters, conversations etc. There appears to be no clear difference between projects that were continued and those that were not. Three general approaches can be identified: (1) reliance on informal communications (6 projects); (2) a combination of formal and informal communications--SENESDC used formal means at a general level and informal means within individual project units; Interstate SDC used a newsletter (In Touch) and informal; ANISA and the Barbour School used both (4 projects); (3) formal at start and a shift to informal--Upper Valley NEPTE and North County Network. Project directors typically noted that they tried to be responsive to user requests for assistance. It is logical, in a response mode, to move toward direct one-to-one communication. If direct communication does not develop, usually it

is because the project staff fails to respond adequately to a request. It is probably fair to say that NEPTE project personnel found they had to "sell themselves" to project users before they could develop and/or implement their projects.

In summary, most projects depended upon informal (direct personal) communication at least at an operational level.

Parity in Project Planning and Operation - The hypothesis of NEPTE staff was that there should be in project governing bodies a 50/50 parity of professional educators and lay or community representatives. This policy accorded with NEPTE's desire to open a dialogue on education and to develop greater cooperation among educators at various levels and with the community in which a given educational program is operated. The responses to this issue were mixed. Seven project directors said there was parity, seven said there was not and one said there was at a grneral level but not at an operational level. There was a very close correspondence to the responses given on shared decision making. Project directors indicated that parity, defined as numerical equality between represented groups, was workable only at a general policy level, if operable at all. Parity was not realistic at an operational level. Project directors said that parity ought to be defined in terms of equity, i.e., representation should reflect the degree to which a given group was actually affected by a program and/or supporting the operation of a given program. In most projects that were continued by non-NEPTE funds (primarily higher education or local school district) the governance of the project reflected the agency supporting the projects. The director of Project ERR noted that parity should be based upon the type of service given and the client group using the service. This statement seemed to reflect the sentiments of most project directors.

In fact, one of the project directors whose project was not continued felt a reason for lack of continuation was that the general Steering Committee under represented teachers.

In summary, equity rather than numerical parity became the operational design for most projects. The problem of obtaining and maintaining effective community representation is still largely unresolved. Some projects had very active community representation, but most projects failed to operationalize the 50/50 representation below the Steering Committee level. If the 50/50 concept is to become an operational reality rather than a paper concept much further attention should be given to the development of the means by which community representation and involvement can be strengthened. It is important to note that all project directors felt that community involvement was necessary even though most project directors disagreed with an arbitrary 50/50 ratio. The fact that all NEPTE project personnel interviewed were favorable to community involvement represents, for most projects, a very definite shift in the attitude of the educators involved. NEPTE was successful in expanding educational dialogue to groups not previously included in the planning and operation of education.

Project Impact - The hypothesis of NEPTE staff was that projects successful in obtaining continuation funds would have created an impact through the development of a process, model, or product. A review of Table A, column eight, shows that there had been an impact in terms of a product/process. All projects not securing continuation funds reported they had not been able to generate impact in terms of a product/process. Those projects not continued noted that they had created an impact which was intangible (Maine SDC, Barbour School) or which rested on a partially developed product or model (Penquiscock, SENESDC). Only one project (North County Network) had developed a product and still failed to obtain continuation

funds. The project director indicated that the project would continue without funds. Clearly, creating an impact through some tangible product or process was critical to project continuation.

Discussion of Linkage Mechanisms and Products/Processes Employed

In Table B are listed the major examples of linkages, if any, reported by the project directors. Mechanisms used to link project resources to user groups varied widely. The project at the University of Maine at Farmington and Interstate SDC provided people (interns or students from colleges) to assist local school teachers. Upper Valley NEPTE, Connecticut SDC, and ANISA provided inservice training for teachers and/or administrators. Project ERR and the North County Network provided resource information available only to clients of a given project. In essence, projects provided a needed service for a group or groups. In some cases the service was the goal of a project, and in other cases the service was the means used to involve client groups in more comprehensive program or staff development efforts. There appears to be no "best" type of linkage mechanism - people, training, and information services all were successfully employed.

The examples of products/processes are also varied. A review of Table B shows that products and processes were about evenly employed. Four projects successfully developed and disseminated a model covering such concepts as early field experience (University of Maine, Farmington), community counselors (Little Harbor), and an integrated day open classroom (Interstate SDC). Other projects developed specific training products in areas such as bilingual/bicultural education (Connecticut SDC) transitional training for new situations (Project ERR) and CBTE modules (SENESDC). Still other projects provided people to fill internship positions (Upper

Valley NEPTE) and newly created staff development positions (Vermont SDC). As in the case of linkage mechanisms, no "best" approach can be defined--models, specific training products and people all were successful in producing project "impact".

TABLE B

Examples of Linkage Mechanisms and Products/Processes Utilized by the Projects

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Project	Examples of Linkage Mechanisms	Examples of Products/Processes
Colebrook School	Parent and student trips integrated into curriculum	Model for community integrated curriculum
University of Maine Farmington	More help for LEA Teachers--IHE students	Field experience model
Upper Valley NEPTE	Course and group meetings for principals	Interns
Little Harbor	Small group trips	Model for community councelors
Barbour School	Agree with statement	Intangibles
Connecticut SDC	Training programs, recruitment list, learning disabilities classroom	bilingual/bicultural training products and processes
N. County Network	Catalogue of resource people	Resource brochure
SENESDC	Each party to SDC went on own	Member institutions develop their products
Maine SDC	Tried workshops--system wide	Intangible outsomes
Vermont SDC	Steering Committee	Staff development positions
Interstate SDC	In Touch newsletter, interns, resource personnel--ind. & team.	Model
Penquiscock	Tried a consortium but didn't reach school committees	Model unclear because of poor definition and diffuse area served
ANISA	Tailored training to fit model to a given setting	ANISA Model--specific training activities
Gresham Chair Project	Assist programs to develop internal support	Wide range of things; the key was the development of individualized services for a person or small group of people
Project ERR	Resource list and Human Resource File	Human Resource File, training arrangements

Conclusions

As noted at the beginning of this section, a survey of NEPTE project directors was conducted in an attempt to identify those factors that were keys to successful projects, defined as those factors that enabled projects to obtain continuation funds from non-NEPTE sources. The following conclusions summarize the key points developed in the analysis of the NEPTE project directors responses:

1. Clearly stated specific goals and objectives are a necessity for developing project support.

2. Most NEPTE projects have been able to establish a dialogue between public school people and college and university people.

3. The ability of a project to develop successful linkage mechanisms is a key factor in project continuation.

4. Shared decision making should not be defined in terms of any particular set of groups.

5. Effective communication is a primary requisite for obtaining project continuation.

6. Most projects depend upon informal, personal communication, at least at the operational level.

7. Equity, rather than numerical parity in governance becomes the operational design for most projects.

8. The ability of a project to generate impact in terms of a tangible product or process is critical for project continuation.

9. There is no "best" type of linkage mechanism; people, training, and information services all were successfully employed.

10. There is no "best" approach in terms of generating project impact; models, specific training products, and people all were successfully employed.

FIELD AGENT REPORT

A Field Agent is . . .? The public might respond: (a) someone who works for a vaguely defined governmental organization whose purposes are unclear; (b) someone who helps farmers improve their productivity, i.e. grow more corn per acre; (c) someone who investigates claims; (d) someone who tries to fill an intermediate management role, i.e. linking the central office of a large corporation, government, educational institution to those people using the product or service within a particular region, state or community. What is a NEPTE Field Agent? There is no single answer to the question. Some general answers are: (a) a person who works to foster the goals of NEPTE; (b) a person who seeks to cause change in teacher education; (c) a person who monitors and evaluates NEPTE funded projects; and (d) a person who provides technical assistance to various constituencies, i.e. supports program development and implementation, acts as a local program advocate and develops linkages to needed resources. All the foregoing "answers" are partially correct.

What did NEPTE envision a Field Agent to be? The NEPTE Field Agent was an <u>invention</u> designed by NEPTE Central Staff to test the proposition that educational innovations could best be designed and implemented by <u>people</u> working within existing educational institutions; people who were willing and able to <u>respond</u> to requests for assistance on the basis of particular <u>program needs</u> rather than organizational management or control needs. In essence, the NEPTE Field Agent was projected as a person who was located <u>within</u> but not a representative <u>of</u> a given institution. The Field Agent's constituencies were seen as open, multiple, and not necessarily limited to those groups formally recognized by the institution in which the Field Agent was located.

Historical Summary

First Year - 1971-1972: Development of the NEPTE Field Agent Concept - During this initial year, NEPTE staff and the Board of Directors were faced with the formidable task of building a unique identity for a newly conceived educational body. The terms unique identity and educational body are deliberately employed. An attempt to describe NEPTE in terms of a mission statement, precise roles, and clearly delineated objectives, fails to adequately describe the evolutionary and idiosyncratic (personal) nature of most NEPTE activities. Further, terms such as institution, organization, agency, corporation and even entity carry implications such as size, fixed structure, routinized operation, hierarchical authority etc. which were consciously avoided by NEPTE. The term body, implying a strong emphasis on the actions of people who collectively are NEPTE's identity, seems to fit.

The following factors were key elements in the development of the NEPTE field agent concept:

1. The experience of the central staff in meeting regionally stated needs through direct, active, on-site responses;

2. The expertise in various educational specialties which provided the base for client requests for NEPTE assistance;

3. The preparation of the 1972-1973 proposal to USOE to "place a specific specialist agent in each of the New England states and in an arrangement agreed upon with each of the Chief State School Officers in the six state region"; and

4. The growing demand for NEPTE assistance which, before the end of the first year, exceeded the physical and personal resources of the central staff.

In effect, the central staff all operated as regional field agents.

The basic hypothesis was that the NEPTE Central Staff itself was an innovation organized to respond to regional program needs and as such could be expected to influence the operation of existing regional institutions. A logical extension of this hypothesis was that field agents based in the respective New England states and organized to respond to program needs in the respective states could be expected to influence the operation of state institutions.

With these general hypotheses in mind, the central staff developed general guidelines for the recruitment of field agents, negotiated state needs and priorities with the Chief State School Officers and submitted a Field Agent Proposal to USOE. The initial characteristics used to screen field agent candidates were:

1. A tolerance for ambiguity - field agent must largely define his own role;

2. An ability to recognize and avoid hierarcheal limitations - field agent must avoid being "captured" by the institution in which he was placed;

3. An area of expertise;

4. A respect for the value of research and development, but tempered with a healthy skepticism - field agent should not "reinvent the wheel" but he should not believe all the "wheels" were in stock;

5. A demonstrated ability and desire to work with people cooperatively; and

6. An ability to accept postponed gratification - field agent should not expect immediate rewards for his efforts.

The negotiations with the Chief State School Officers resulted in the following priorities for field agents in the respective states:

1. Maine - Staff Training and Resource Development;
2. N.H. - Leadership Training;
3. Vt. - Evaluation;
4. Mass. - Metropolitan Staff Development;
5. R.I. - Competency Based Teacher Education; and
6. Conn. - Bilingual Education.

The field agents' time was also negotiated and resulted in a 60/40 ratio of in-state to out-of-state field agent responsibility. In effect, the field agents were expected to expand NEPTE Central's influence on regional institutions and begin to develop strategies for influencing state institutions using their area of expertise as an entry, but hopefully not limiting their influence to just their specialty area.

Second Year - 1972-1973 - Establishment of a Field Agent Network - The initial months (July and August 1972) were devoted to recruitment of field agents. This process proved to be more difficult than expected, and, consequently, was not completed as scheduled (June 1972). The primary reason for the difficulty turned out to be a reluctance on the part of most applicants to meet the criteria for field agents. Relatively few professionals were interested in spending a major portion (75% or more) of their time in the field. By September 1972 all six field agents were placed in their respective states. During their first year of operation the field agents spent more than 60% of their time instate with one exception, the field agent in Maine. It was earlier noted that field agents had to largely define their own role. Consequently, a review of field agent activities for 1972-1973 shows there was no generalizable pattern. The following major types of activities were conducted by the six field agents:

Maine - program development assistance, linkage functions, project consultant, project evaluator including evaluation design assistance, fund seeker and proposal writer, and project advocacy. This field agent was perhaps the most active of all field agents in fund seeking and proposal writing.

N.H. - program development assistance and general consultant to local school district Staff Development Committees (1/3 of the districts in the state), consultant for open education activities throughout the New England region. This field agent resigned at the close of the year. The major reason given was excessive travel.

Vt. - in-state evaluation consultant for both NEPTE and the State Department of Education, assistance in designing evaluation proposals and plans, production of an annotated bibliography on evaluation.

Mass. - proposal development assistance for Boston area schools and for the Massachusetts Regional State Department Office. This field agent was unable to operate in an ambiguous situation and resigned in April 1973.

R.I. - project consultant and evaluator, planning assistance for workshops and conferences, technical assistance to programs, consultant to state level groups, proposal writing, general writing. This field agent was perhaps the most active of all the field agents in writing materials for publication.

Conn. - development of curriculum materials, recruitment of Spanish-speaking teachers, writing for publication, assistance in planning and operating conferences and workshops.

From the foregoing brief review, it is clear that no set pattern exists for the field agents. One common thread was service of various kinds in response to program needs. Another common point for all but the Maine field agent was the high degree of in-state time. Finally, all but the Maine field agent (and his area of expertise was general) tended to tie most of their activities to their specialty and not get involved with "new" areas. At the close of the 1972-1973 year it was clear that all field agents were being utilized. In fact, the high demand within each state for the field agents' time posed a conflict with the initially negotiated 60/40 ratio. The demand largely validated the need for the field agents and their particular need designation. Yet, the high in-state usage may well have weakened the desired regional impact (a more complete discussion of the field agent and his effect on regional and state institutions will be presented in a Working Paper to be published at a later date).

Third Year - 1973-1974: A Time for Hard Decisions - The philosophical basis and the hypotheses earlier stated remain unchanged. However, NEPTE faced a major crisis during this year. Funds for the New England Regional Commission (which had largely supported NEPTE programs since 1971) were reduced in 1973-1974 and are expected to terminate June 1974. Further the USOE Field Agent Grant was uncertain and expected to be reduced in 1974-1975 and perhaps terminated June 1975. The direct and immediate effect on field agent operation was that field agents had to look toward their own survival. One way to insure survival was to get the institution in which the field agent was located to think seriously about increasing its support, financial

and other, for the field agent position and eventually pick-up the total cost of the position. Such action would insure the position, but seriously weaken the regional thrust intended by NEPTE. The issue was not in any way resolved during this year. NEPTE Central did agree to renegotiate the 60/40 ratio. The result was that all field agents spent 80% or more of their time in-state on projects, programs or activities more directly associated with state institutions and priorities than with regional institutions or NEPTE priorities. There was also less regional field agent activity. Field agents tended to work within their state. Formal discussion concerning ways to institutionalize the field agent concept were begun in Maine and Massachusetts.

Field Agent Activities - 1973-1974

Maine - Most activities had to do with:

1. Planning for workshops, activities, proposals, etc.;

2. Participating in or conducting workshops and on-going group meetings;

3. Evaluating activities and projects and follow-up discussions of evaluation activities;

4. Writing final project reports;

5. Writing or assisting in the writing of proposals to secure funds for on-going projects or proposed projects; and

6. Linkage functions.

When one compared the Maine field agent activities for this year with the previous year, it was clear that the Maine field agent was shifting from considerable out-of-state acitivity to 80% in-state activity.

New Hampshire - The field agent divided her time between two major roles.

1. State Department of Education - process-generalist on staff development and open education. The field agent was assigned the responsibility of assisting Staff Development Committees in the local school districts (the state was divided into thirds with the field agent being responsible for one-third of the districts) and,

2. NEPTE - specialist in open education programs development.

The major acitvities engaged in were:

1. Inservice training - staff development for State Department of Education personnel;

2. Identification of and cateloguing human resources in the 14 teacher preparation institutions that could be used for local school district staff development activity;

3. Writing for publication;

4. Consultant to New England groups working on open education;

5. Planning and conducting meetings;

6. Planning for and assisting in the implementation of programs;

7. Establishing linkages to resources; and

8. Monitoring and assisting in the designing of program evaluation activities.

This field agent resigned at the close of the 1973-1974 year giving excessive travel and physical and mental exhaustion due to the demanding nature of the position as the reason.

Connecticut - There were two field agents during 1973-1974 in Connecticut. Renaldo Matos was employed as Bilingual specialist by the Department of Education in December 1973 and replaced by Dr. Alexander Plante in January 1974

who was a staff member of the Connecticut Staff Development Cooperative. The major emphasis throughout the whole year was on developing bilingual education programs. Bilingual education efforts were conducted on a cooperative basis between the Connecticut State Department of Education and the Connecticut Staff Development Cooperative.

The major activities engaged in were: (1) Planning and conducting workshops for inservice education; (2) Curriculum development; (3) Curriculum materials development; and (4) Recruitment of bilingual teachers from outside of the United States.

The two field agents indicated that the following things will last:

1. Local education agency bilingual activities;
2. A shift to local education design of bilingual education;
3. Cost-accountable programs;
4. Inservice training and recruitment of bilingual teachers; and
5. Those programs presently existing which meet state and federal funding requirements.

The two field agents also indicated that the following two things would not last (1) poorly defined bilingual programs and (2) overgeneralized programs (programs which do not focus on specific activities and cut across roles typically held by other institutions such as teacher preparation institutions). A new field agent, Rosa Queseda, was appointed for the 1974-1975 year.

Rhode Island - The activities of the Rhode Island field agent shifted from a 60/40 to a 90/10 instate to out-of-state ratio. There were three general objectives:

1. Support of competency based teacher education programs at Rhode Island College and the University of Rhode Island;

2. Development of a library on competency based teacher education and certification for the general use of Rhode Island educators and operated through the Education Information Center of the Rhode Island Teacher Center; and

3. Support of state level planning groups who are developing competency based teacher education and certification plans.

The major activities engaged in were: (1) Planning support; (2) Consultant assistance; (3) Establishing linkages to resources, both personnel and material; (4) Planning and conducting workshops; (5) Planning evaluation procedures and analysis of evaluation data; (6) Follow up activities in regard to evaluation data; (7) Proposal writing; and (8) Writing materials for general publication.

Massachusetts - Massachusetts field agent was located in the Greater Boston Regional Education Center. There were considerable changes occuring in the Regional Center which make precise description of field agent activities difficult. The Regional Center expanded from two professionals, one secretary and one NEPTE field agent to a total of 22 professionals (including the NEPTE field agent) and three non-professionals. Also a major planning grant ($1,000,000.) was secured. The planning grant (Metropolitan Planning Grant) also employed field agents. Finally, the move toward regionalization caused the Regional Center to move to locations out of Boston and to add special education personnel. The major activities engaged in were:

1. Organization and planning fo training sessions/workshops directed at area superintendents, early childhood educators and teacher-student design education alternative programs;

2. Providing technical assistance to the Greater Boston Regional Education Center for staff development and to the student service division of the State Department of Education;

3. Developing linkages with area superintendents, close-up program, energy "hotline" project, minority recruitment (this was part of the Governors legislative package) and Title III projects on occupation and special education; and

4. Writing and distributing an effective-assistance manual.

Vermont - There were two field agents in Vermont during this year. The first field agent Joe Pietrapolo resigned in December 1973 and was replaced by Mrs. Lois Abeles. During the first half of the year the field agent concentrated almost totally on providing planning and consultant assistance to the Vermont State Department of Education or other Vermont institutions on matters concerning evaluation design, operation and analysis and on the development and publication of an annotated bibliography. During the second half of the year the new field agent had a three part role, splitting her time between NEPTE, the University of Massachusetts ANISA Program and the Vermont State Department of Education. The NEPTE portion of her role involved being a generalist who could disseminate and apply ANISA theory in those state institutions interested in the ANISA model. NEPTE was also interested in assisting in the dissemination of a new model, namely, using a person as a linker as opposed to paper edicts. The State Department of Education role involved assisting in the implementation of the Vermont design (a plan allowing local school districts to develop in-service certification programs), lending assistance to Title III "Community Educational Agents" project which involved the implementation and evaluation of those programs within the several state department of education divisions.

The major activities engaged in were: (1) Planning for various state department of education proposals; (2) Research activity; (3) Analysis and cost productions in several areas of evaluation, planning, and reports; and (4) Planning and conducting ANISA workshops.

Conclusions

During the 1974-1975 year, an attempt will be made to evaluate the impact of the NEPTE Central Staff and field agents to determine whether the hypotheses earlier stated (influence on regional and state institutions) are supported. In this section "conclusions" refers to those aspects of field agent operation on which there is NEPTE staff (central and field) consensus. The following comments are not listed in any particular order of importance.

1. When the skill area of a field agent is a relatively new skill, the focus will be on a consultant rather than a facilitative role.

2. As initially anticipated, it has been impossible to provide a single definition of the field agent role. The field agents have, in fact, defined their own unique roles.

3. Field agents should not consider themselves only as experts in a particular competency, or residents of a particular state.

4. People flexible enough to fill multiple roles can accomplish many tasks while ostensibly doing one.

5. Field agents originally were placed in the "cracks" of their parent organization. It now appears that being located on the boundary of the organization is a more effective description. In essence, being in the "cracks" means being totally in a given organization with outward movement restricted. Being on the boundary of an organization means being from but not in the organization making outward movement considerably easier in multiple directions.

6. The field agent model of being "on the boundary" will be an effective model for SDC personnel in dealing with local school district personnel.

7. Field agents must have a high ability in self-starting and self-sustaining.

8. Field agents must have a needed skill or area of expertise, but be able to perform generalist functions as well.

9. Few educational professionals will be able or willing to function in a highly field oriented job (75% or more of their time).

10. Field agents can serve as a disinterested person, i.e. provide a middle ground for discussion, advocate an idea not an institution. One field agent commented that a field agent is "the gadfly which is seen as initiating or stimulating each of the elements that produced the viable program".

11. The field agents perceptions constantly change so his role is dynamic.

12. As presently constituted the demands on the field agents, particularly the travel demands, are severe causing a person to "burn out" in a year or two. One field agent noted that "the field agent job must be seen as a short-term experience".

13. There is considerable mental strain resulting from "operating in widely-differing environments on an almost day-to-day basis".

14. As a person operates in the role of field agent, he or she tends to move toward the middle of the specialist-generalist continuum.

15. NEPTE Central Staff can mediate role conflicts, i.e., when the activities and/or priorities assigned to a field agent by NEPTE and by the agent's state institution are conflicting, and greatly assist the respective field agents resist "institutional capture".

16. The geographical distance between the NEPTE Central Staff and the six field agents makes formal training difficult. Consequently, informal

Central Staff training of field agents through the use of on-site visits seems more workable.

17. Supervision and systematic reporting is difficult. Initially, communication was one way NEPTE Central to field agents. Support of field agents was the central theme. Gradually return communication, field agents to NEPTE Central, is strengthening. Support for NEPTE in the form of service (products, processes, models) is the central theme. Perhaps, this two phase communication at least in terms of frequency was not accidental, i.e. before field agents could support NEPTE they first had to become established which required much NEPTE assistance.

PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS

During the year-long process of arriving at an appointment to the Gresham Chair, NEPTE began to identify schools in which school and community people shared in significant decisions about educational program. Some of these schools received grants in FY 1973, some in FY 1974, to facilitate discovery of solutions to various questions and problems in this process. These projects are noted earlier in this Annual Report.

In addition, a NEPTE committee has been interested in identifying the actual evidence of partnership in shared resources and shared decision-making. The identified schools are both public and private, secondary and elementary; they are urban, suburban, small town, and rural. They differ in numerous ways in governance, from informal involvement to formal, parliamentary, representative governing committees.

The chief event of this past year was the production of a slide film of three of the schools - Barbour, Colebrook, and Westminster West - with commentary based on taped interviews with teachers, parents, and students of the schools. This presentation was supplemented with discussion material

developed in last year's cooperative project with Massachusetts PTA. The resulting program was offered in a 5-hour workshop at U Mass Marathon and in a 2½-hour workshop at National PTA Convention in San Antonio.

THE COMMON

In the 1973 NEPTE Annual Report it was noted that NEPTE had begun a newspaper called The Common which had a circulation (June 1973) of 50,000. During FY 74 the circulation grew to 100,000 the paper published 10 issues (September 1973 - June 1974), the number of pages per issue expanded from eight to 12 and the amount of advertising grew markedly. The Common under the editorship of Frank Morgan has continued to receive both high praise and strong criticism, both of which were intended outcomes. In short, The Common has stimulated dialogue, often spirited, among educators in New England and drawn many community people into the dialogue. Though not all readers would agree, the wish of the NEPTE Board of Directors that the Common not become a house organ has been fulfilled. Also, the section "Calendar of Upcoming Events of Interest to New England" has increasingly been utilized by various educational organizations.

Not all is positive! Though advertising has grown so too have costs due to expanded circulation. NEPTE has managed to support the extra cost by economizing in other areas. Vigorous attempts have been made to get increased subscriptions, secure support from bulk receivers (colleges, teacher's groups, and the like) and through field-agent discussions with present or potential bulk users as to possible ways to help support a useful service. Very little success resulted from these efforts.

Consequently, the future of The Common is uncertain, to state the case kindly. Some possible alternatives are: (1) stop publication; (2) reduce

the circulation so that advertising will more nearly cover costs, although then advertisers would then reduce their support etc. etc. etc.; (3) locate sizable outside support; or (4) some combination of two and three. NEPTE feels The Common is a valuable service and should continue. NEPTE will do all it can to keep The Common alive if not fully well. Any help from its friends would be appreciated.

WILSON P. DENNETT
Public Accountant
86 High Street
Hampton, New Hampshire 03842

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

August 31, 1974

Board of Directors
The New England Program in Teacher Education
Pettee Brook Offices
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Gentlemen:

In accordance with your instructions, I have examined the books and records of The New England Program in Teacher Education for the fiscal year July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974. The examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as were considered necessary in the circumstances.

In my opinion, the accompanying Balance Sheet and Statement of Income & Expenditures, present fairly the financial position of The New England Program in Teacher Education at June 30, 1974 and the results of its operations for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with the preceding year.

Very truly yours,

Wilson P. Dennett
WPD/bb

Exhibit A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The New England Program in Teacher Education
Pettee Brook Offices
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Balance Sheet
June 30, 1974

Assets

Current Assets		
Cash in Checking Account		
Merchants National Bank-Dover (Clearing)	$ 138,583.06	
Durham Trust Co. (Conferences)	9.46	
Strafford National Bank-Dover (Partnerships)	9.31	
Merchants Nat'l Bank-Dover (Central Office)	2.86	
Merchants Nat'l Bank-Dover (Field Agents)	(2,380.14)	
Merchants Nat'l Bank-Dover (Publications)	4,207.92	
Strafford Nat'l Bank-Dover (Special Gillette Project)	8.86	
Strafford Nat'l Bank-Dover (Rockingham Project)	3,842.90	
Total		$ 144,284.23
Cash in Savings Account		
The Merchants Savings Bank-Dover #37962	3,088.29	
The Merchants Savings Bank-Dover #38419	2,813.42	
Total		5,901.71
Projects Due		
Rockingham Project	11,525.60	
Field Agent-Maine 1972-73	5,464.00	
Twin States	31,936.00	
Interstate 505	9,216.19	
Mass. Special Ed.	6,000.00	
Vt. Principals Project	8,500.00	
Total		72,641.79
Due from Nercoe		6,689.71
Total Assets		229,517.44

Liabilities & Surplus

Current Liabilities		
Grants Encumbered Schedule I	33,224.00	
Projects Encumbered Schedule II	72,641.79	
Total		105,865.76
Surplus Reserve		
Balance, June 30, 1974		123,651.68
Total Liabilities & Surplus		$ 229,517.44

WILSON & DENNETT, A PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT, HAMPTON, N. H.

Exhibit B

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The New England Program in Teacher Education
Pettee Brook Offices
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Statement of Receipts and Expenditures
for fiscal year July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974

Clearing Account

Balance, July 1, 1973				$ 122,158.27
Receipts				
Payments from Grantees				
Regional Commission	1973-74	82,000.00		
O.E. Maine	1973-74	160,000.00	242,000.00	
Certificate of Deposits			200,000.00	
Savings Accounts			75,705.64	
Interest Earned				
Certificate of Deposits		21,515.97		
Savings Accounts		3,067.95	24,583.92	
Fees from Conferences, Rebates & Professional Services			72,780.66	
Total Receipts				615,070.22
Total Funds Available				737,228.49
Expenditures				
Grant Payments Made			190,289.00	
Clearing Account			25,046.20	
Grants Within NEPTE				
Conferences		9,004.45		
Partnerships		9,412.76		
Central		110,176.77		
Field Agents		156,430.13		
Publications		94,554.17		
Special Account		3,731.95		
Total			383,310.23	
Total Expenditures				598,645.43
Balance, June 30, 1974				$ 138,583.06

WILSON P. BENNETT • PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT • HAMPTON, N. H.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Board of Directors (as of September 1, 1974)

Name	State
James Aldrich	Maine
Paul Andrews	Vermont
John Crenson	Rhode Island
Elmer Dodge	Maine
Charles Fortes	Rhode Island
Jean Garvin	Vermont
William Hebert	Massachusetts
Warren Hill	Connecticut
Arlin Hunt	Vermont
Robert MacMillan	Rhode Island
Bernice Miller	Massachusetts
Harold Pierson	New Hampshire
Charlotte Ryan	Massachusetts
Nancy Sandberg	New Hampshire
Mark Shibles	Maine
Bernice Smith	New Hampshire
Catherine Smith	Connecticut
Jane Stickney	Vermont
Mary Jane Stinson	Connecticut
Elizabeth Ward	Massachusetts
Charles Webb	Connecticut
Vacancy	Maine
Vacancy	Rhode Island

Core Staff	Area of Specialization
Roland Goddu, Director	Evaluation, Organization Development
Jean Tufts, Project Officer	Special Education
Francis Fuller, Field Agent	Resources for Ed. Personnel
Carolyn Sweetser, Field Agent	Staff Development Programs
	Early Childhood
Elizabeth Collins, Field Agent	Curriculum Development and Evaluation
Louis Amadio, Field Agent	Metropolitan Staff Development
John Pitman, Field Agent	Performance Based Certification and Teacher Education
Rose Quezeda, Field Agent	Bilingual-Bicultural Spanish
Albie Davis, Assoc. Field Agent	Alternative Education Programs
Robert Trombly	Information and Dissemination

For Further Information Contact:

NEPTE
Pettee Brook Offices
PO Box 550
Durham, New Hampshire 03824